



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/627,580         | 7/28/2000   | Woudenberg et al.     | 4291C3              |

| EXAMINER            |              |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Khatol Shahman-Shah |              |
| ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1645                | 16           |

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Leonard Bowersox (Reg. 33226) (3) Dr. Rodney Swartz  
(2) Jasbir Singh (4) Khatol Shahman-Shah

Date of Interview 7/1/03

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☐ was not reached. N/A

Claim(s) discussed: All pending claims 1, 41-58 Specially claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Yes Bouma et al. (5,648,801) in regard to the merits of pending 103 Rejection.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The attorney is arguing (MPEP) 706.04 and paragraph in regard to the patent # 6126899 of full fate and credit of the previous examiner of the patent 6126899. Attorney is arguing the main claim of current invention with the main claim of patent # 6126899 containing the same limitations. The examiner told the attorney that (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

She will reconsider the action and will order application of patent # 6126899 to review prosecution history - The examiner will get back to the attorney before July 9, 2003.

Khatol Shahman-Shah